



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,904	07/21/2003	Kenneth E. Welker	14.0246-US	7670
28116	7590	12/09/2008	EXAMINER	
WesternGeco L.L.C.			HUGHES, SCOTT A	
Jeffrey E. Griffin			ART UNIT	
10001 Richmond Avenue			PAPER NUMBER	
HOUSTON, TX 77042-4299			3663	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/09/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/623,904

**Applicant(s)**

WELKER ET AL.

**Examiner**

SCOTT A. HUGHES

**Art Unit**

3663

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6, 18, 25, 30 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 6, 18, 25, 30 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 8/26/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the real time orientation calculation done in Stephen does not disclose initial and current values of orientation is not persuasive. Because the orientation is determined in real time, the current real time value is the current value and all past values determined in the real time determination of orientation are initial values.

Applicant's arguments that Stephen does not disclose comparing the initial value to the current value are not persuasive. Stephen teaches that the orientation is determined for each signal, and that the transposition of the data is then calculated from the orientations from each signal. Therefore, the orientation determined from set of signals is compared to the orientation from the next set of signals in determining the transposition.

Applicant's arguments that Bittleston and Sato do not teach that a change in orientation would show that the cable has moved are not persuasive. Stephen teaches detecting orientation in real time, and Bittleston and Sato both teach that movements of a device are shown by changes in orientation of the device. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that if the orientation changes, then the object whose orientation is being measured has moved. If the object has not moved at all, but has rather remained in exactly the same location in the exact same position, then the orientation would not change.

Applicant's arguments that modifying Stephen with the teachings of Orban would change the principle operation of the prior art are not persuasive. Although Orban requires the devices to be planted into the ground for the method disclosed therein, the accelerometers themselves do not perform their function only when planted into the ground. As Orban was only used for the teaching of DC signals from accelerometers, modifying Stephen to include DC signals from accelerometers does not change the operation of the system.

Applicant's arguments are therefore not persuasive.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-6, 18, 30, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen in view of Orban (6353577) and Bittleston (US20020126575).

With regard to claim 5, Stephen discloses determining at least one initial value of at least one orientation sensor coupled to at least one ocean bottom cable (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses determining at least one current value of the at least one orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58;

Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses calculating the orientation with the accelerometers in real-time, and therefore there are continuous initial and current values of orientation being generated by the accelerometers. Stephen discloses comparing the initial value of the orientation sensor to the current value of the orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63; Column 5, lines 20-45). Stephen does not specifically state that a step of determining whether or not the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison is made, but since the orientation signals generated by the accelerometers are processed in real time, a change in the orientation would be shown in real time. Bittleston teaches that changes in orientation (angles and inclination) are caused by movements ([0023-0028]). Bittleston further teaches that progressively changing (comparison of one to the other) values of angle (orientation) are caused by movement ([0028]). From the teaching of Bittleston that movement of a device is indicated by a change in its measured orientation, it would be obvious that changes in the orientation measured by Stephen would be an indication that the cable to which they are attached has moved (at least showing movement in the angular position, or roll, as described by Bittleston). Stephen does not disclose that the values of the orientation sensors are values of a DC signal of the sensors. Stephen discloses that accelerometers are used to determine the orientation signals, but does not disclose what type of signal is generated by the accelerometers that allows for the orientation to be determined. Orban teaches accelerometers used to determine orientation of seismic sensing units based upon the sensed acceleration due to gravity (as taught by Stephen) (Column 3).

Orban teaches that the accelerations due to gravity (low frequency signals) sensed by the accelerometers are in the form of DC signals (Column 3). It would be obvious to use accelerometers in Stephen that use DC signals to determine accelerations due to gravity as taught by Orban in order to be able to separate out low frequency signals as DC signals for use in determination of the local gravity effect on the sensor for finding orientation.

With regard to claim 6, Stephen discloses that the ocean bottom cable comprises a plurality of orientation sensors coupled thereto (Figs. 1, 2a,b), and that the comparing comprises comparing a plurality of initial orientation values to a plurality of current values of the orientation sensor (Column 2; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Bittleston further teaches that progressively changing (comparison of one to the other) values of angle (orientation) are caused by movement ([0028]).

With regard to claim 18, Stephen discloses at least one ocean bottom cable (Fig. 1) (Column 3, Line 60 to Column 4, Line 15). Stephen discloses at least one seismic sensor 14,15,16 coupled to the at least one ocean bottom cable (Figs. 2a-c) (Column 4, Line 15 to Column 5, Line 8). Stephen discloses at least one orientation sensor 5,6,7 coupled to the at least one ocean bottom cable (Figs. 2a-c) (Column 4, Lines 8-63). Stephen discloses a signal processing unit (Column 4, Lines 53-63) capable of determining at least one initial value of at least one orientation sensor coupled to at least one ocean bottom cable (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63) and capable of determining at least one current value of the at least one orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63).

Stephen discloses calculating the orientation with the accelerometers in real-time, and therefore there are continuous initial and current values of orientation being generated by the accelerometers. Stephen discloses comparing the initial value of the orientation sensor to the current value of the orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63; Column 5, lines 20-45). Stephen does not specifically state that a step of determining whether or not the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison is made, but since the orientation signals generated by the accelerometers are processed in real time, a change in the orientation would be shown in real time. Bittleston teaches that changes in orientation (angles and inclination) are caused by movements ([0023-0028]). Bittleston further teaches that progressively changing (comparison of one to the other) values of angle (orientation) are caused by movement ([0028]). From the teaching of Bittleston that movement of a device is indicated by a change in its measured orientation, it would be obvious that changes in the orientation measured by Stephen would be an indication that the cable to which they are attached has moved (at least showing movement in the angular position, or roll, as described by Bittleston). Stephen does not disclose that the values of the orientation sensors are values of a DC signal of the sensors. Stephen discloses that accelerometers are used to determine the orientation signals, but does not disclose what type of signal is generated by the accelerometers that allows for the orientation to be determined. Orban teaches accelerometers used to determine orientation of seismic sensing units based upon the sensed acceleration due to gravity (as taught by Stephen) (Column 3). Orban teaches that the accelerations due to gravity (low frequency signals)

sensed by the accelerometers are in the form of DC signals (Column 3). It would be obvious to use accelerometers in Stephen that use DC signals to determine accelerations due to gravity as taught by Orban in order to be able to separate out low frequency signals as DC signals for use in determination of the local gravity effect on the sensor for finding orientation.

With regard to claim 30, Stephen discloses an article comprising one or more machine-readable storage media containing instructions that enable a processor to perform a method (described below) (Column 2, Lines 25-65; Column 4, Line 53 to Column 5, Line 5). Stephen discloses determining at least one initial value of at least one orientation sensor coupled to at least one ocean bottom cable (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses determining at least one current value of the at least one orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses calculating the orientation with the accelerometers in real-time, and therefore there are continuous initial and current values of orientation being generated by the accelerometers. Stephen discloses comparing the initial value of the orientation sensor to the current value of the orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63; Column 5, lines 20-45). Stephen does not specifically state that a step of determining whether or not the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison is made, but since the orientation signals generated by the accelerometers are processed in real time, a change in the orientation would be shown in real time. Bittleston teaches that changes in orientation (angles and inclination) are caused by



movements ([0023-0028]). Bittleston further teaches that progressively changing (comparison of one to the other) values of angle (orientation) are caused by movement ([0028]). From the teaching of Bittleston that movement of a device is indicated by a change in its measured orientation, it would be obvious that changes in the orientation measured by Stephen would be an indication that the cable to which they are attached has moved (at least showing movement in the angular position, or roll, as described by Bittleston). Stephen does not disclose that the values of the orientation sensors are values of a DC signal of the sensors. Stephen discloses that accelerometers are used to determine the orientation signals, but does not disclose what type of signal is generated by the accelerometers that allows for the orientation to be determined. Orban teaches accelerometers used to determine orientation of seismic sensing units based upon the sensed acceleration due to gravity (as taught by Stephen) (Column 3). Orban teaches that the accelerations due to gravity (low frequency signals) sensed by the accelerometers are in the form of DC signals (Column 3). It would be obvious to use accelerometers in Stephen that use DC signals to determine accelerations due to gravity as taught by Orban in order to be able to separate out low frequency signals as DC signals for use in determination of the local gravity effect on the sensor for finding orientation.

With regard to claim 35, Stephen discloses means for determining at least one initial value of at least one orientation sensor coupled to at least one ocean bottom cable (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses means for determining at least one current value of the at least one

orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63).

Stephen discloses calculating the orientation with the accelerometers in real-time, and therefore there are continuous initial and current values of orientation being generated by the accelerometers. Stephen discloses means for comparing the initial value of the orientation sensor to the current value of the orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63; Column 5, lines 20-45). Stephen does not specifically state there are means for determining whether or not the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison is made, but since the orientation signals generated by the accelerometers are processed in real time, a change in the orientation would be shown in real time. Bittleston teaches that changes in orientation (angles and inclination) are caused by movements ([0023-0028]). Bittleston further teaches that progressively changing (comparison of one to the other) values of angle (orientation) are caused by movement ([0028]). From the teaching of Bittleston that movement of a device is indicated by a change in its measured orientation, it would be obvious that changes in the orientation measured by Stephen would be an indication that the cable to which they are attached has moved (at least showing movement in the angular position, or roll, as described by Bittleston). Stephen does not disclose that the values of the orientation sensors are values of a DC signal of the sensors. Stephen discloses that accelerometers are used to determine the orientation signals, but does not disclose what type of signal is generated by the accelerometers that allows for the orientation to be determined. Orban teaches accelerometers used to determine orientation of seismic sensing units based upon the sensed acceleration due to gravity

(as taught by Stephen) (Column 3). Orban teaches that the accelerations due to gravity (low frequency signals) sensed by the accelerometers are in the form of DC signals (Column 3). It would be obvious to use accelerometers in Stephen that use DC signals to determine accelerations due to gravity as taught by Orban in order to be able to separate out low frequency signals as DC signals for use in determination of the local gravity effect on the sensor for finding orientation.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen in view of Analog Devices (ADXL202E) and Bittleston (US20020126575).

With regard to claim 25, Stephen discloses a system for carrying out a seismic survey (abstract; Column 1, Line 65 to Column 2, Line 56). Stephen discloses at least one ocean bottom cable (Fig. 1) (Column 3, Line 60 to Column 4, Line 15). Stephen discloses at least one seismic sensor 14,15,16 coupled to the at least one ocean bottom cable (Figs. 2a-c) (Column 4, Line 15 to Column 5, Line 8). Stephen discloses at least one orientation sensor 5,6,7 coupled to the at least one ocean bottom cable (Figs. 2a-c) (Column 4, Lines 8-63). Stephen discloses a signal processing unit (Column 4, Lines 53-63) capable of determining at least one initial value of at least one orientation sensor coupled to at least one ocean bottom cable (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63) and capable of determining at least one current value of the at least one orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses calculating the orientation with the accelerometers in real-time, and therefore there are continuous initial and current values of orientation being generated

by the accelerometers. Stephen discloses comparing the initial value of the orientation sensor to the current value of the orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63; Column 5, lines 20-45). Stephen does not specifically state that a step of determining whether or not the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison is made, but since the orientation signals generated by the accelerometers are processed in real time, a change in the orientation would be shown in real time. Bittleston teaches that changes in orientation (angles and inclination) are caused by movements ([0023-0028]). Bittleston further teaches that progressively changing (comparison of one to the other) values of angle (orientation) are caused by movement ([0028]). From the teaching of Bittleston that movement of a device is indicated by a change in its measured orientation, it would be obvious that changes in the orientation measured by Stephen would be an indication that the cable to which they are attached has moved (at least showing movement in the angular position, or roll, as described by Bittleston). Stephen discloses that accelerometers are used as the orientation sensors, but does not disclose the specific type of accelerometer used. Stephen does state that the accelerometers can be piezoelectric, piezoresistive, or capacitive accelerometers (Column 5). Analog Devices (ADXL202E, 2000) teaches a capacitive, dual axis accelerometer formed on an integrated circuit chip that can be used to sense accelerations due to gravity (Pages 1, 8-12). It would have been obvious to modify Stephen to include the dual axis accelerometer formed on an integrated circuit chip as taught by Analog Devices as the accelerometers used to

sense accelerations due to gravity in order to be able to measure full 360 degrees of orientation through gravity.

Claims 5-6, 18, 30, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen in view of Orban (6353577) and Sato (6229102).

With regard to claim 5, Stephen discloses determining at least one initial value of at least one orientation sensor coupled to at least one ocean bottom cable (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses determining at least one current value of the at least one orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses calculating the orientation with the accelerometers in real-time, and therefore there are continuous initial and current values of orientation being generated by the accelerometers. Stephen discloses comparing the initial value of the orientation sensor to the current value of the orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63; Column 5, lines 20-45). Stephen does not specifically state that a step of determining whether or not the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison is made, but since the orientation signals generated by the accelerometers are processed in real time, a change in the orientation would be shown in real time. Sato teaches that movements of a device are shown by changes in its orientation as measured by accelerometers (Figs. 1-7, 28) (abstract; Column 5, Line 30 to Column 6, Line 22; Column 8, Line 66 to Column 12, Line 14). As taught by Sato, movement of an object (act of handwriting) causes changes in the inclination of the object as measured

by accelerometers. Therefore, it would be obvious that changes in inclination measured by the accelerometers in Stephen would be indicative movement as taught in Sato. Stephen does not disclose that the values of the orientation sensors are values of a DC signal of the sensors. Stephen discloses that accelerometers are used to determine the orientation signals, but does not disclose what type of signal is generated by the accelerometers that allows for the orientation to be determined. Orban teaches accelerometers used to determine orientation of seismic sensing units based upon the sensed acceleration due to gravity (as taught by Stephen) (Column 3). Orban teaches that the accelerations due to gravity (low frequency signals) sensed by the accelerometers are in the form of DC signals (Column 3). It would be obvious to use accelerometers in Stephen that use DC signals to determine accelerations due to gravity as taught by Orban in order to be able to separate out low frequency signals as DC signals for use in determination of the local gravity effect on the sensor for finding orientation.

With regard to claim 6, Stephen discloses that the ocean bottom cable comprises a plurality of orientation sensors coupled thereto (Figs. 1, 2a,b), and that the comparing comprises comparing a plurality of initial orientation values to a plurality of current values of the orientation sensor (Column 2; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Sato also teaches comparing past and current values of an orientation sensor (Figs. 1-7; 34-35) (abstract; Columns 5-6; Column 8, Line 66 to Column 12, Line 14).

With regard to claim 18, Stephen discloses at least one ocean bottom cable (Fig. 1) (Column 3, Line 60 to Column 4, Line 15). Stephen discloses at least one seismic

sensor 14,15,16 coupled to the at least one ocean bottom cable (Figs. 2a-c) (Column 4, Line 15 to Column 5, Line 8). Stephen discloses at least one orientation sensor 5,6,7 coupled to the at least one ocean bottom cable (Figs. 2a-c) (Column 4, Lines 8-63). Stephen discloses a signal processing unit (Column 4, Lines 53-63) capable of determining at least one initial value of at least one orientation sensor coupled to at least one ocean bottom cable (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63) and capable of determining at least one current value of the at least one orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses calculating the orientation with the accelerometers in real-time, and therefore there are continuous initial and current values of orientation being generated by the accelerometers. Stephen discloses comparing the initial value of the orientation sensor to the current value of the orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63; Column 5, lines 20-45). Stephen does not specifically state that a step of determining whether or not the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison is made, but since the orientation signals generated by the accelerometers are processed in real time, a change in the orientation would be shown in real time. Sato teaches that movements of a device are shown by changes in its orientation as measured by accelerometers (Figs. 1-7, 28) (abstract; Column 5, Line 30 to Column 6, Line 22; Column 8, Line 66 to Column 12, Line 14). As taught by Sato, movement of an object (act of handwriting) causes changes in the inclination of the object as measured by accelerometers. Therefore, it would be obvious that changes in inclination measured by the accelerometers in Stephen would be indicative movement

as taught in Sato. Stephen does not disclose that the values of the orientation sensors are values of a DC signal of the sensors. Stephen discloses that accelerometers are used to determine the orientation signals, but does not disclose what type of signal is generated by the accelerometers that allows for the orientation to be determined. Orban teaches accelerometers used to determine orientation of seismic sensing units based upon the sensed acceleration due to gravity (as taught by Stephen) (Column 3). Orban teaches that the accelerations due to gravity (low frequency signals) sensed by the accelerometers are in the form of DC signals (Column 3). It would be obvious to use accelerometers in Stephen that use DC signals to determine accelerations due to gravity as taught by Orban in order to be able to separate out low frequency signals as DC signals for use in due to gravity sensed by accelerometers are in the form of DC signals.

With regard to claim 30, Stephen discloses an article comprising one or more machine-readable storage media containing instructions that enable a processor to perform a method (described below) (Column 2, Lines 25-65; Column 4, Line 53 to Column 5, Line 5). Stephen discloses determining at least one initial value of at least one orientation sensor coupled to at least one ocean bottom cable (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses determining at least one current value of the at least one orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses calculating the orientation with the accelerometers in real-time, and therefore there are continuous initial and current values of orientation being generated by the accelerometers. Stephen discloses



comparing the initial value of the orientation sensor to the current value of the orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63; Column 5, lines 20-45). Stephen does not specifically state that a step of determining whether or not the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison is made, but since the orientation signals generated by the accelerometers are processed in real time, a change in the orientation would be shown in real time. Sato teaches that movements of a device are shown by changes in its orientation as measured by accelerometers (Figs. 1-7, 28) (abstract; Column 5, Line 30 to Column 6, Line 22; Column 8, Line 66 to Column 12, Line 14). As taught by Sato, movement of an object (act of handwriting) causes changes in the inclination of the object as measured by accelerometers. Therefore, it would be obvious that changes in inclination measured by the accelerometers in Stephen would be indicative movement as taught in Sato. Stephen does not disclose that the values of the orientation sensors are values of a DC signal of the sensors. Stephen discloses that accelerometers are used to determine the orientation signals, but does not disclose what type of signal is generated by the accelerometers that allows for the orientation to be determined. Orban teaches accelerometers used to determine orientation of seismic sensing units based upon the sensed acceleration due to gravity (as taught by Stephen) (Column 3). Orban teaches that the accelerations due to gravity (low frequency signals) sensed by the accelerometers are in the form of DC signals (Column 3). It would be obvious to use accelerometers in Stephen that use DC signals to determine accelerations due to gravity as taught by Orban in order to be able to separate out low frequency signals as

DC signals for use in due to gravity sensed by accelerometers are in the form of DC signals.

With regard to claim 35, Stephen discloses means for determining at least one initial value of at least one orientation sensor coupled to at least one ocean bottom cable (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses means for determining at least one current value of the at least one orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses calculating the orientation with the accelerometers in real-time, and therefore there are continuous initial and current values of orientation being generated by the accelerometers. Stephen discloses means for comparing the initial value of the orientation sensor to the current value of the orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63; Column 5, lines 20-45). Stephen does not specifically state that there are means for determining whether or not the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison is made, but since the orientation signals generated by the accelerometers are processed in real time, a change in the orientation would be shown in real time. Sato teaches that movements of a device are shown by changes in its orientation as measured by accelerometers (Figs. 1-7, 28) (abstract; Column 5, Line 30 to Column 6, Line 22; Column 8, Line 66 to Column 12, Line 14). As taught by Sato, movement of an object (act of handwriting) causes changes in the inclination of the object as measured by accelerometers. Therefore, it would be obvious that changes in inclination measured by the accelerometers in Stephen would be indicative movement as taught in Sato. Stephen

does not disclose that the values of the orientation sensors are values of a DC signal of the sensors. Stephen discloses that accelerometers are used to determine the orientation signals, but does not disclose what type of signal is generated by the accelerometers that allows for the orientation to be determined. Orban teaches accelerometers used to determine orientation of seismic sensing units based upon the sensed acceleration due to gravity (as taught by Stephen) (Column 3). Orban teaches that the accelerations due to gravity (low frequency signals) sensed by the accelerometers are in the form of DC signals (Column 3). It would be obvious to use accelerometers in Stephen that use DC signals to determine accelerations due to gravity as taught by Orban in order to be able to separate out low frequency signals as DC signals for use in due to gravity sensed by accelerometers are in the form of DC signals.

Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephen in view of Analog Devices (ADXL202E) and Sato (6229102).

With regard to claim 25, Stephen discloses a system for carrying out a seismic survey (abstract; Column 1, Line 65 to Column 2, Line 56). Stephen discloses at least one ocean bottom cable (Fig. 1) (Column 3, Line 60 to Column 4, Line 15). Stephen discloses at least one seismic sensor 14,15,16 coupled to the at least one ocean bottom cable (Figs. 2a-c) (Column 4, Line 15 to Column 5, Line 8). Stephen discloses at least one orientation sensor 5,6,7 coupled to the at least one ocean bottom cable (Figs. 2a-c) (Column 4, Lines 8-63). Stephen discloses a signal processing unit (Column 4, Lines

53-63) capable of determining at least one initial value of at least one orientation sensor coupled to at least one ocean bottom cable (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63) and capable of determining at least one current value of the at least one orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63). Stephen discloses calculating the orientation with the accelerometers in real-time, and therefore there are continuous initial and current values of orientation being generated by the accelerometers. Stephen discloses comparing the initial value of the orientation sensor to the current value of the orientation sensor (Column 2, Lines 1-58; Column 3, line 60 to Column 4, Line 63; Column 5, lines 20-45). Stephen does not specifically state that a step of determining whether or not the at least one ocean bottom cable has moved based on the comparison is made, but since the orientation signals generated by the accelerometers are processed in real time, a change in the orientation would be shown in real time. Sato teaches that movements of a device are shown by changes in its orientation as measured by accelerometers (Figs. 1-7, 28) (abstract; Column 5, Line 30 to Column 6, Line 22; Column 8, Line 66 to Column 12, Line 14). As taught by Sato, movement of an object (act of handwriting) causes changes in the inclination of the object as measured by accelerometers. Therefore, it would be obvious that changes in inclination measured by the accelerometers in Stephen would be indicative movement as taught in Sato. Stephen discloses that accelerometers are used as the orientation sensors, but does not disclose the specific type of accelerometer used. Stephen does state that the accelerometers can be piezoelectric, piezoresistive, or capacitive accelerometers (Column 5). Analog Devices (ADXL202E, 2000) teaches a capacitive,

dual axis accelerometer formed on an integrated circuit chip that can be used to sense accelerations due to gravity (Pages 1, 8-12). It would have been obvious to modify Stephen to include the dual axis accelerometer formed on an integrated circuit chip as taught by Analog Devices as the accelerometers used to sense accelerations due to gravity in order to be able to measure full 360 degrees of orientation through gravity.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **SCOTT A. HUGHES** whose telephone number is (571)272-6983. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Keith can be reached on (571) 272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. A. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3663

/Jack W. Keith/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3663